

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

JERONE MCDOUGALD,	:	Case No. 1:18-cv-498
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
	:	District Judge Timothy S. Black
vs.	:	Magistrate Judge Karen L. Litkovitz
	:	
SHANNON BEAR, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

This civil case is before the Court pursuant to the Order of General Reference to United States Magistrate Judge Karen L. Litkovitz. Pursuant to such reference, the Magistrate Judge reviewed the relevant pleadings and circumstances of the case and, on June 26, 2019, submitted a Report and Recommendation (Doc. 10), recommending that Plaintiff’s motion to amend the complaint be DENIED and the case be dismissed, because Plaintiff has failed to pay the filing fee, pursuant to this Court’s prior Order (Doc. 9). Plaintiff filed objections to the Report and Recommendation on July 15, 2019 (Doc. 11), which this Court has accepted as timely (Not. Order, Aug. 29, 2019).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “The filing of objections provides the district court with the opportunity to consider the *specific* contentions of the parties and to correct any errors immediately.” *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 950 (6th Cir. 1981) (emphasis added). “A party’s objections are not sufficiently specific if they merely restate the claims made in the initial petition, ‘disput[e] the correctness’ of a report and recommendation without specifying the findings purportedly in error, or simply ‘object[ ] to the report and recommendation and refer[ ] to several of the issues in the case.’” *Bradley v. United States*, No. 18-1444, 2018 WL 5084806, at \*3 (6th Cir. Sept. 17, 2018) (quoting *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995)). Here, Plaintiff’s objections fail entirely to address the issue of his failure to pay the filing fee and, thus, do not constitute “specific written objections” to the Report and Recommendation. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2) (emphasis added). Moreover, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations are thorough and accurate, and, accordingly, **Plaintiff’s objections are overruled.**

As required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), the Court has reviewed the comprehensive findings of the Magistrate Judge and considered *de novo* all of the filings in this matter. Upon consideration of the foregoing, the Court determines that the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 10) should be, and is hereby, adopted in its entirety. Accordingly:

1. Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendations (Doc. 11) are **OVERRULED**;
2. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 10) is **ADOPTED**;
3. Plaintiff's motion to amend the complaint (Doc. 8) is hereby **DENIED** and the case is hereby **DISMISSED**;
4. Plaintiff remains liable for the full filing fee of \$400.00, which shall be paid pursuant to the instructions provided in the Report and Recommendation. (Doc. 10);
5. The Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly, whereupon this case is **TERMINATED** on the docket of this Court; and
6. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), the Court certifies that an appeal of this Order would not be taken in good faith and, therefore, this Court **DENIES** Petitioner leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: 8/29/2019

s/ Timothy S. Black  
Timothy S. Black  
United States District Judge